Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 1–?? (2002) Printed 15 December 2014 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

Luminous Blue Variables are Antisocial: Their Isolation Implies they are Kicked Mass Gainers in Binary Evolution

Nathan Smith[1⋆] & Ryan Tombleson[1]
[1] *Steward Observatory, University of Arizona, 933 North Cherry Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA*

arXiv:1406.7431v2 [astro-ph.SR] 12 Dec 2014

Accepted 0000, Received 0000, in original form 0000

ABSTRACT

Based on their relatively isolated environments, we argue that luminous blue variables (LBVs) must be primarily the product of binary evolution, challenging the traditional single-star view wherein LBVs mark a brief transition between massive O-type stars and Wolf-Rayet (WR) stars. If the latter were true, then LBVs should be concentrated in young massive clusters like early O-type stars. This is decidedly not the case. Examining locations of LBVs in our Galaxy and the Magellanic Clouds reveals that, with only a few exceptions, LBVs systematically avoid clusters of O-type stars. In the Large Magellanic Cloud, LBVs are statistically much more isolated than O-type stars, and (perhaps most surprisingly) even more isolated than WR stars. This makes it impossible for LBVs to be single "massive stars in transition" to WR stars. Instead, we propose that massive stars and supernova (SN) subtypes are dominated by bifurcated evolutionary paths in interacting binaries, wherein most WR stars and SNe Ibc correspond to the mass donors, while LBVs (and their lower-mass analogs like B[e] supergiants, which are even more isolated) are the mass gainers. In this view, LBVs are evolved massive blue stragglers. Through binary mass transfer, rejuvinated mass gainers get enriched, spun up, and sometimes kicked far from their clustered birthsites by their companion's SN. This scenario agrees better with LBVs exploding as Type IIn SNe in isolation, and it predicts that many massive runaway stars may be rapid rotators. Mergers or blue Thorne-Zykow-like objects might also give rise to LBVs, but these scenarios may have a harder time explaining why LBVs avoid clusters.

Key words: binaries: general — stars: evolution — stars: winds, outflows

1 INTRODUCTION

Mass loss is inexorably linked to evolution for high-mass stars. In fact, it has a *deterministic* influence, which in turn has tremendous impact on other areas of astronomy influenced by stellar feedback (regulating star formation, galaxy evolution, chemical evolution, reionization, etc.). For most of their lives, massive stars above $\sim$20 $M_{\odot}$ shed mass in fast winds that affect their subsequent evolution, but in post-main sequence (post-MS) phases the mass loss becomes critical in determining the type of resulting supernova (SN). The most dramatic mass loss in post-MS evolution is during the luminous blue variable (LBV) phase.

Some of the most pressing issues in massive star research concern resolving problems with mass-loss rates and how they are incorporated into evolutionary models, as well as the treatment (or neglect) of close binaries in these models (see recent reviews by Smith 2014; Langer 2012). A majority of massive stars are in binary systems whose separation is small enough that they will exchange mass (Sana et al. 2012, 2008, 2009; Kiminki & Kobulnicky 2012; Kiminki et al. 2012; Kobulnicky et al. 2014; Chini et al. 2012; Mahy et al. 2009; Evans et al. 2006; De Becker et al. 2006; Garcia & Mermilliod 2001; Gies 1987). With current uncertainties in mass loss and mass transfer, connecting massive stars to their end fates as various types of SN explosions is still very challenging. LBVs and their eruptive mass loss have emerged as the linchpin in our paradigm for the evolution of single massive stars. In light of recent estimates of lower mass-loss rates for clumpy winds, eruptive mass loss of LBVs would need to be the primary agent responsible for turning most H-rich O stars (above $\sim$30-35 $M_{\odot}$, the upper limit for red supergiants) into H-free Wolf-Rayet (WR) stars before they die as SNe Ibc (Smith & Owocki 2006). However, our understanding of the physics and evolutionary states of LBVs is still poor, and their connection to (or overlap with) the evolution of close binary systems leaves many open questions. When ideas about LBVs were

⋆ Email: nathans@as.arizona.edu

© 2002 RAS

taking shape, Gallagher (1989) discussed mass-transferring binaries and how they may provide suitable explanations for LBVs, but for whatever reason, these ideas did not appear to dominate the interpretation of LBVs and so they were mostly discussed as very massive single-stars. Later, Soker (2004) mentioned difficulties in explaining the formation of the nebula around η Carinae with a single star, although that paper did not discuss evolutionary aspects of LBVs. The role of binarity and initial mass in evolution is a central question we address here from a new perspective, by studying LBV environments.

LBVs were recognized early-on as the brightest blue irregular variables in nearby spiral galaxies like M31, M33, and NGC 2403 (Hubble & Sandage 1953; Tammann & Sandage 1968), originally referred to as the "Hubble-Sandage variables". Famous Galactic objects like P Cygni and η Carinae had spectacular outbursts in the 17th and 19th centuries, respectively, and appeared to share many of the same properties, so they were grouped together and called "LBVs" by Conti (1984). Over a dozen true LBVs are now identified in the Milky Way (MW) and the Large and Small Magellanic Clouds (LMC/SMC), and a similar number resides in other Local Group galaxies (Humphreys & Davidson 1994; van Genderen 2001; Smith et al. 2004; Clark et al. 2005). Stars that spectroscopically resemble LBVs with similar luminosity and color, but which have not (as yet) been observed to show the signature eruptive variability of LBVs, are often called "LBV candidates"; these are presumed to be temporarily dormant LBVs.

The traditional view of LBVs, which emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, is that they correspond to a very brief *transitional* phase of evolution of the most massive single stars, when the star moves from core H burning, through the onset of H shell burning, to the core He burning phase (Humphreys & Davidson 1994; Lamers & Nugis 2002). The motivation for a very brief phase comes from the fact that LBVs are extremely rare compared to O stars: the duration of the LBV phase is thought to be only a few 10^4 yr (Humphreys & Davidson 1994) based on this line of reasoning.[1] A typical and often quoted monotonic evolutionary scheme for a star of 60-100 $M_\odot$ initially is:

O star $\rightarrow$ Of/WNH $\rightarrow$ LBV $\rightarrow$ WN $\rightarrow$ WC $\rightarrow$ SN Ibc.

In this scenario, the strong mass-loss experienced by LBVs is a crucial component of the central paradigm of massive star evolution, which is that a star's own mass loss determines its evolution. High luminosity powers strong radiatively driven winds, and this wind mass loss propels the evolution that converts the most massive H-rich main-sequence stars to become H-free WR stars. This is the co-called "Conti scenario" (Conti 1976). LBVs are crucial to this picture because of the recent downward revisions of O-star mass-loss rates, as noted above (see review by Smith 2014 and many references therein). Thus, single massive stars of 30-80 $M_\odot$ do not have strong enough winds to make WR stars on their own; LBV eruptions are needed (Smith & Owocki 2006).[2]

The LBV phase is still generally presumed to arise in the evolution of single stars (Groh et al. 2014), and it is *required* in the standard scenario for single massive-star evolution. The origin of the instability is not fully understood, but it is expected that the core luminosity goes up with time as the growing He core contracts, while winds steadily reduce the stellar mass. Thus, the ratio L/M goes up until the star confronts the classical Eddington limit and somehow erupts with catastrophic mass loss (Humphreys & Davidson 1994; Maeder 1992; Ulmer & Fitzpatrick 1998). As seen in the case of η Car, these eruptions can eject 10-20 $M_\odot$ in a single event (Smith et al. 2003a).

While this traditional view of LBVs persisted through the 1990s (Humphreys & Davidson 1994), in the past decade or so, several problems have emerged that threaten it. One issue has to do with the interpretation of LBV variability and the behavior of their winds. The proposed interpretation was that during a standard S Dor eruption, the star brightens while staying at constant bolometric luminosity because its mass-loss rate is assumed to increase, which in turn initiates a cooler and brighter "pseudo photosphere" (Humphreys & Davidson 1994). However, quantitative spectroscopy has since revealed that mass-loss rates in S Dor outbursts do not increase enough to cause true pseudo photospheres (de Koter et al. 1996; Groh et al. 2009a), and the changes do not really occur at constant bolometric luminosity (Groh et al. 2009a). Instead, the brightening in an S Dor event is more akin to a pulsation or temporary inflation of the envelope, perhaps driven by the sub-surface Fe opacity peak (Gräfener et al. 2012).

Similarly, the traditional explanation for LBV giant eruptions was that they experience a substantial *increase* in their bolometric radiative luminosity (for reasons unexplained) that temporarily pushes them well above the classical Eddington limit (Humphreys & Davidson 1994; Humphreys et al. 1999); this necessarily initiates a super-Eddington continuum-driven wind (Owocki et al. 2004). However, several lines of evidence now point to an explosive mechanism driving LBV giant eruptions, instead of (or in addition to) a wind (Smith 2008, 2013; Smith et al. 2003a). Moreover, spectra of the light echoes from η Car's 19th century Great Eruption seem inconsistent with a wind pseudo-photosphere (Rest et al. 2012; Prieto et al. 2014).

These considerations point to problems with our interpretation of the physics behind LBV eruptions, but even more serious problems have arisen with the traditional role played by LBVs in evolution. The first clear sign of something very fishy came from the recognition that eruptive LBVs are the most likely progenitors of a particular class of luminous narrow-lined SNe with Type IIn spectra (SNe IIn). The dense H-rich circumstellar material (CSM) of some SNe IIn requires eruptive pre-SN mass loss akin to LBVs, and in some cases very large CSM mass budgets (see review by Smith 2014). Other aspects of the CSM around SNe IIn point to wind variability reminiscent of LBVs (Trundle et al.

[1] Some recent single-star models indicate longer LBV phases of 1-2 $\times$ 10^5 yr (Groh et al. 2014), but it is unclear if this longer LBV lifetime (and shorter WR lifetime) agrees with observed statistics.

[2] It may be possible that near-Eddington luminosities in the most massive O stars around 100 $M_\odot$ (especially WNH stars), might be strong enough to make WR stars without an intervening LBV phase (Gräfener et al. 2011). In this case, the remaining He cores would be more massive than any observed H-free WR stars (Smith & Conti 2008; Crowther 2007). Such massive He stars might be rare, so this is not yet a solved issue.



Figure 1. Each panel shows the distribution of known O-type stars as seen projected on the sky around the LBV listed in the upper left corner (that LBV is located at the origin of each plot). AG Car, η Car, HR Car, and Wra 751 are all in the same part of the sky and their plots overlap, but they are at different distances, so we show a separate plot for each. The location of the LBV candidate Hen 3-519 is indicated in the AG Car plot, and the candidate HD 168625 and the LBV HD 168607 are at almost the same position, outside M17. Three different bins of O star spectral types are color coded: Solid green circles are early O stars (O5 and earlier), orange diamonds are mid O stars (O6-O7), and blue unfilled circles are late O stars (O8 and O9). A very rough size scale is noted in each panel, appropriate for the (often uncertain) distance to that LBV.

2008; Kotak & Vink 2006; Groh & Vink 2011). Moreover, we now have four direct detections of LBV-like progenitors of SNe IIn, including SN 1961V, SN 2005gl, SN 2010jl, and SN 2009ip (Gal-Yam & Leonard 2009; Smith et al. 2010, 2011c; see review by Smith 2014). In the traditional paradigm of single-star evolution, massive LBVs are prohibited from exploding as SNe IIn, because LBVs represent merely a brief intermediate phase after core-H burning and before core-He burning. They should still have 0.5-1 Myr to live as a WR star, and should die without their H envelopes.

Another clue that something was seriously amiss came from "SN impostors", which are thought to be LBV giant eruptions associated with very massive stars in external galaxies (Smith et al. 2011a). For some nearby SN impostors, detections of their relatively low-luminosity dust-enshrouded progenitors, as well as the ages of surrounding stars, suggest either progenitors that are 10-15 $M_{\odot}$ BSGs/RSGs or even $\sim$8 $M_{\odot}$ super-AGB stars (e.g., Prieto et al. 2008; Thompson et al. 2009; Kochanek et al. 2011; Gogarten et al. 2009). This is much lower than the



Figure 2. Same as Figure 1, but for the confirmed LBVs in the LMC. We do not include a separate plot for R85, since it is very close to S Dor in the same association. We also include a panel that shows the locations of all LBVs in the LMC for reference. Note that the plot for R 71 is blank (no O-type stars around).

initial masses attributed to eruptive LBVs, which are generally above 25 $M_{\odot}$ (Smith et al. 2004). The reason this is physically significant is because these lower-mass stars ($\sim$8 $M_{\odot}$) never approach the Eddington limit in their normal evolution, but they appear to suffer LBV-like eruptions anyway. If they can do this, then the physical cause of the outbursts might not be related exclusively to high initial mass, but perhaps some other exotic mechanism (collisions, mergers, etc.). Additionally, Anderson and collaborators (Anderson & James 2009; Anderson et al. 2012; Habergham et al. 2014) examined the spatial correlation between various types of extragalactic SNe or SN impostors, as compared to presumed indicators of youth such as Hα emission in their host galaxies. On the one hand, they found the expected result that SNe II-P (arising from 8-20 $M_{\odot}$ stars; Smartt 2009) are less correlated with Hα than stripped-envelope SNe. However, they also found the very surprising result that *SN impostors and SNe IIn are apparently even less correlated with star formation than SNe II-P*. This was curious, and motivated us to take another look at LBVs in the MW and LMC/SMC.

In this paper, we will argue that the likely solution to many of these problems with LBVs resides in binary evolution, and that the resulting SN kicks may be quite

important in explaining their isolation. The idea that binary interaction influences the outcomes of stellar evolution is not a new one (Paczynski 1967), and various aspects including SN kicks have been studied in theoretical work by several groups (Podsiadlowski et al. 1992; van Rensbergen et al. 1996; Vanbeveren et al. 1998, 2007; Belczynski & Bulik 1999; Izzard et al. 2004; Cantiello et al. 2007; de Mink et al. 2007, 2013; Eldridge et al. 2008, 2011; Eldridge & Stanway 2009). Uncertainty persists in the difficult problems of mass transfer and the subsequent evolution of the mass gainer. The way that LBVs may fit into this picture is disussed in more detail later in the paper.

We begin with a discussion of the projected locations on the sky of classic Galactic and Magellanic Cloud LBVs as compared to the locations of O-type stars (§2). This includes a qualitative examination of the sites of individual LBVs, as well as a quantitative statistical comparison of the relative isolation of early, mid, and late-type O stars, WR stars, LBVs, B[e] supergiants, and RSGs. For this statistical comparison, we only consider stars in the LMC and SMC, due to large distance and reddening uncertainties in the Milky Way. In §3 we discuss how these results are fundamentally incompatible with the standard monotonic evolutionary view of LBVs as the descendants of very massive single stars, and in §4 we argue for an alternative view of bifurcated evolutionary paths for massive stars (where the "bifurcation" corresponds to mass donors and mass gainers). In §5 we discuss the environments of extragalactic SN impostors and SNe. We end (§6) with an epilogue about why something so simple as the avoidance of OB-star clusters by LBVs was not emphasized before.

2 POSITIONS OF LBVS RELATIVE TO O-TYPE STARS AND YOUNG CLUSTERS

2.1 Environments of Individual LBVs

In Figures 1, 2, and 3 we present maps of O-type stars in the surrounding environments for several individual cases of well-studied LBVs. The positions of O-type stars are taken from the SIMBAD databse.[3] This depends on the spectral type listed in SIMBAD, which in some cases contains errors. As a check, we also made similar plots using the very recently revised Galactic O-star Catalog (Maíz Apellániz et al. 2013). Using this newer catalog (not shown), some spectral types changed slightly (for example, some B0 stars changed to late O-types and vice versa, and some O stars shifted from our early-type bin to late-type or vice versa), but this did not change the overall result described below where LBVs generally avoid clusters of O stars. It did not, for example, produce O-star clusters where there were none previously.

For Galactic LBVs we plot a projected size on the sky of ±3.8 deg, and for stars in the Magellanic Clouds we plot ±0.3 deg. In each case this represents (very roughly) the surrounding several 10^2 pc of each LBV. This is the 2D location projected on the sky, which gives the LBVs the "benefit of the doubt" that they are actually at the same distance as the O-type stars seen near them on the sky. We did not attempt to correct for distances along the line-of-sight to further cull the sample of O-type stars, because that may introduce a bias. For example, in many cases, such as Milky Way LBVs whose distances are based on radial velocities, the distance adopted might be substantially wrong if the star has a peculiar velocity. Since our main finding is that LBVs are relatively isolated, treating all stars projected on the sky as being at the same distance is conservative.



Figure 3. Same as Figure 1, but for the two confirmed LBVs in the SMC.

In this study, we concentrate on confirmed LBVs that have relatively low visual-wavelength extinction, plus a few well-studied and unobscured LBV candidates with shells. We therefore exclude LBVs and candidates in the Galactic Center or Wd1, for example (see Clark et al. 2005, 2009). The reason we exclude these is because we examine the spatial distribution of O-type stars around LBVs, but the sample and distribution of O-types stars may be highly incomplete in regions with high visible obscuration. Moreover, the instances of known LBVs with high extinction will be biased to those residing in dense clusters, since their LBV-like

[3] http://simbad.u-strasbg.fr/simbad/

Table 1. LBVs and their Nearby O stars in SIMBAD

LBV (name)	Galaxy (name)	$M_{\rm eff}$ ($M_\odot$)	D1 (deg)	D2 (deg)	ST1	ST2
η Car	MW	250	0.011	0.016	O9.5 V	O8.5 V
AG Car	MW	100	0.413	0.442	O8	O9.5
(Hen 3-519)	MW	45	0.646	0.697	O8	O9.5
HR Car	MW	35	0.148	0.784	O9 II	O9 Ib
P Cyg	MW	55	0.325	0.507	O9 III	O5e
HD160529	MW	32	1.119	1.145	O9 III	O8 III
HD168607	MW	(30)	0.195	0.262	O8 V	O5 V
(HD168625)	MW	28	0.206	0.272	O8 V	O5 V
Wra 751	MW	50	0.051	0.195	O8 V	O9 V
MWC930	MW	32	1.511	1.828	O8.5V	O8n
R143	LMC	60	0.00519	0.00641	O3.5 III	O8 Ib
R127	LMC	90	0.00475	0.00547	O9.7 II	O8.5 II
S Dor	LMC	55	0.0138	0.0144	O8.5 V	O8.5 V
R81	LMC	(40)	0.1236	0.1291	O5 V	O6 Ib
R110	LMC	30	0.2805	0.3080	O8.5 V	O5 V
R71	LMC	29	0.4448	0.4714	O9 II	O8.5 V
MWC112	LMC	(60)	0.0892	0.1729	O9 V	O8 III
R85	LMC	28	0.0252	0.0288	O8.5 V	O8.5 V
(R84)	LMC	30	0.1575	0.2276	O9 II	O9 II
(R99)	LMC	30	0.0412	0.0832	O9 II	O9.5 V
(R126)	LMC	(40)	0.0358	0.0836	O9.5 I	O8.5 V
(S61)	LMC	90	0.1432	0.1542	O7 III	O9.5 III
(S119)	LMC	50	0.3467	0.3694	O8.5 V	O9 V
(Sk-69142a)	LMC	60	0.0522	0.1524	O9 V	O9.5 V
(Sk-69279)	LMC	52	0.0685	0.0993	O9.5 III	O8 V
(Sk-69271)	LMC	50	0.0406	0.0593	O9.5 III	O8 V
HD5980	SMC	150	0.0191	0.0191	O8 V	O5.5 V
R40	SMC	32	0.1112	0.1131	O8 V	O9 V
(R4)	SMC	(30)	0.0160	0.0560	O8.5 V	O9.5 V

Notes:
Names of LBV candidates are noted in parentheses.
$M_{\rm eff}$ = Adopted effective initial ZAMS mass (not a measurement) based on single-star evolutionary tracks appropriate for the star's present-day luminosity (see §4, and Figure 6). For Galactic objects, uncertainty is dominated by the distance and is hard to quantify. For MC sources, uncertainties are dominated by assumptions about the treatment of interior physics in the evolutionary models. Those with relatively poorly constrained luminosity and mass have the representative mass in parentheses.
D1 = projected distance to nearest O star (ignoring bound companions); used in Figure 4.
D2 = projected distance to second-nearest O star; used in Figure 5.
ST1 = spectral type of nearest O star.
ST2 = spectral type of 2nd nearest O star.

nature is often discovered serendipitously when their host cluster is studied. Our selection criteria are therefore that we include all confirmed LBVs in the MW, LMC, and SMC, except those that are highly reddened. We also include LBV candidates with a massive CSM shell that likely indicates a previous LBV-like giant eruption, but again we exclude those that are heavily reddened. The discovery of circumstellar LBV nebulae (usually accomplished with narrow-band imaging) is not biased against detecting them in star clusters (e.g., η Car and R127 are both in clusters and their nebulae are easily detected), so it is unlikely that the inclusion of LBV candidates with shells will bias the results. There is no detection bias against recognizing LBVs themselves in clusters, since any LBV should be the visually brightest member in a cluster. The potential bias works the other way — i.e. that the O stars may be harder to detect next to a bright LBV. However, it is unlikely that clusters of O stars surrounding LBVs have escaped detection, since LBVs have been studied with high-contrast imaging to detect faint nebular shells (e.g., Weis 2003; Stahl 1987).

The list of specific LBVs and LBV candidates we consider is given in Table 1, and plots of the spatial distribution of O-type stars surrounding each confirmed LBV are given in Figure 1 for LBVs in the MW, and Figures 2 and 3 for the LMC and SMC, respectively. Table 1 lists various measured quantities for these LBVs, including D1, D2, ST1, ST2, and $M_{\rm eff}$. D1 and D2 are the projected distances on the sky (in degrees) between the LBV and the nearest O star (D1) and the second-nearest O-type star (D2). D1 and D2 do not include companion O stars when an LBV is in a bound binary or multiple system. For the LMC and SMC targets, these values are used for the distributions plotted in Figures 4 and 5, respectively. ST1 and ST2 are the corresponding spectral types of these nearest and second-nearest O-type stars, for reference. One can see that in most cases, the nearest O stars are relatively late-type, rather than early O-type stars. $M_{\rm eff}$ is a rough estimate of the effective initial mass of the star, as a guide for what to expect if one were to assume that single-star evolutionary models are applicable (see Fig. 6). A key result in this paper is that the surrounding environments of most of the LBVs don't match expectations for stars with such high $M_{\rm eff}$, indicating that single-star models are probably inapplicable.

After contemplating Figures 1, 2, and 3 for a time, one comes away with the qualitative but nevertheless stunning realization that LBVs are often remarkably isolated, and that they generally seem to avoid massive clusters where most O-type stars are concentrated. A few LBVs are in clus-

ters or associations and their values of $M_{\rm eff}$ may not seem to be in obvious conflict with their surroundings, but the majority of known LBVs are much more isolated than they should be for their value of $M_{\rm eff}$. (For the $M_{\rm eff}$ values implied for LBVs — even the low luminosity ones — *all* LBVs should be closely associated with mid to early O-type stars on the main sequence.) Individual objects in these two categories are discussed below.

2.1.1 LBVs in or near Clusters and OB Associations

η Carinae: The famous LBV η Car is indeed in a young massive star cluster (Tr16 in the Carina nebula) containing a number of other massive O type stars (see Smith 2006), so in this sense its environment seems to make sense for the traditional view of LBVs — *but it is the only one!* η Car is also the most extreme case; the initial mass implied by its luminosity is of order 200-250 $M_{\odot}$ (see Table 1), so even if it were the result of a merger that doubled its mass, both component stars must have been extremely massive. At such high initial mass and luminosity, H-core burning lifetimes of stars converge to be almost the same; below 100 $M_{\odot}$, differences in lifetimes for different main-sequence masses will be more significant.

HD 5980: This is the most luminous star in the SMC, which was considered a WR star until it was observed to suffer an LBV eruption in the 1990s (see Koenigsberger & Moreno 2008 for a review). It is in a close binary with another WR star, plus a wider companion O star. It is usually ascribed as a member of the massive young cluster NGC 346, which contains a number of early O-type stars. Upon close examination, however, HD 5980 is actually located well outside the cluster, at least 20-30 pc from the cluster center in projection. It is about 0.2 deg or at least $\sim$20 pc from any other O-type star (excluding its own bound companions).

R127: This is one of the classic high-luminosity LBVs, closely resembling AG Car in many respects, and it is the brightest star in the LMC when at its maximum of the S Dor cycle. Aside from η Car, R127 is the only LBV that clearly resides in a cluster, but in this case it is a very small cluster by comparison. Heydari-Malayeri et al. (2003) have studied the host cluster of R127 in detail (see also Walborn et al. 1991); it is a small Trapezium-like group of which only 14 members have been detected, and which shows a large age spread with some stars that are apparently 6-8 Myr old. Since R127 has a very high luminosity and a very high inferred initial mass of $\sim$90 $M_{\odot}$, the divide between R127's presumed mass and that of the older stars in this very small cluster ($\sim$25 $M_{\odot}$) would be very surprising in a standard single-star evolutionary scenario.

P Cygni: This classic LBV is not in a cluster, but it is in the extended Cyg OB1 association. This region has a substantial space and age spread, making an environmental estimate of P Cygni's age and mass very uncertain (the implied $M_{\rm ZAMS}$ is roughly 15–50 $M_{\odot}$ based on the types of nearby main-sequence stars). According to its luminosity compared to single-star evolutionary tracks, P Cyg should have an initial mass of roughly 55 $M_{\odot}$.

S Dor and R85: These two LBVs are in the OB association LH41 (see Massey et al. 2000), which is broadly similar to the loose association in which P Cygni resides. The LH41 association has a very large age spread, containing early O-type stars as well as evolved stars with likely initial masses of 10-15 $M_{\odot}$ (Massey et al. 2000; see their Table 6 and Figure 7). The initial mass and age of any LBV in this association therefore has a large uncertainty, potentially extending down to quite low masses. Based on their luminosities, S Dor and R85 should have initial masses of 55 and $\sim$28 $M_{\odot}$, respectively.

HD 168607 and 168625: These two stars (one LBV and one LBV candidate) form a suspiciously close pair, found only $\sim 1'$ ($\sim$0.5 pc) apart on the sky. HD 168607 is a confirmed LBV, and HD 168625 is an LBV candidate based on its unusual triple-ring nebula (Smith 2007) resembling the one around SN 1987A. They are found in the vicinity of the M17 nebula, but not in its central star cluster NGC 6618. They are located $\sim$20-30 pc outside NGC6618, well separated from the cluster and its associated bright nebulosity.

Wra 751: Although Wra 751 is projected on the sky amid the loose Car OB2 association, the implications of its apparent membership are unclear and its distance is very uncertain. This region looks down a tangent in the Carina spiral arm, and several clusters and groups of OB stars that are unrelated in 3D space are projected near one another (indeed, Wra 751 is thought to be more distant than most of its neighboring O stars in Figure 1). Wra 751 is in a crowded field. Pasquali et al. (2006) discussed a small cluster that they attributed as the likely birth cluster of Wra 751 based on similar reddening. Like some other LBVs discussed here, however, Wra 751 is separated from the rest of the grouping of massive stars in the cluster. It resides about $3'$ (or at least 5 pc projected separation at 6 kpc distant) southwest of the small cluster's center, whereas the other stars claimed to be members have a tight grouping within $\sim 1'$ (Pasquali et al. 2006). Moreover, while Wra 751's luminosity implies an initial mass of 50 $M_{\odot}$ or more from single-star tracks (Table 1), the cluster does not contain any early or mid O-type stars. The five brightest and bluest stars in the cluster identified by Pasquali et al. (2006) include 3 late O-type stars (O8 V, O9 V, and O9 I) and two early BSGs with luminosities suggestive of initial masses closer to 20-25 $M_{\odot}$ and an age older than 4 Myr. Even if this cluster is the birthsite of Wra 751, it implies a cluster turnoff mass that is not commensurate with Wra 751's very high luminosity and mass.

R143: This luminous LBV has an implied initial mass of $\sim$60 $M_{\odot}$ (Table 1). It is found in the LH100 association, which is distinct from and well outside the central R136 cluster in 30 Dor (about 40 pc away).

In summary, even among the LBVs that are projected on the sky near other O-type stars, only the extreme case of η Car is clearly in a young massive cluster. R127 is in a tiny cluster with only a couple other massive stars, some of which are much older than expected for a coeval cluster if R127 really has $M_{\rm ZAMS} \simeq 90$ $M_{\odot}$. A few LBVs are near but outside a cluster (HD 5980, HD 168607, HD 168625, Wra 751), and a few others are in loose OB associations with large age spreads that permit a wide range of initial masses (P Cyg, S Dor, R85, R143). Even granting the benefit of the doubt that they are actually associated with nearby O stars projected near them on the sky, it remains astonishing that these constitute less than half the known LBVs.

2.1.2 Relatively Isolated LBVs

More than half the LBVs in our sample are in no cluster or OB assocation at all, and many are 100s of pc from any O-type star. This is in contrast to the vast majority (∼80-90%; see Figs. 4 and 5) of O stars that do reside in clusters. Isolated LBVs are discussed here.

AG Car and Hen 3-519: Both these very luminous stars are found in a relative void between the Carina Nebula and the large and diverse Car OB2 association. Projected on the sky, AG Car is more than 0.4 deg from the nearest O-type star, and Hen 3-519 is even farther away. At a distance of ∼3 kpc (corresponding to many of the O stars in that direction), this would indicate a separation from the nearest O stars of at least 20 pc, which is surprising considering that AG Car's very high luminosity implies an initial mass around 100 $M_{\odot}$. The distance to AG Car is highly uncertain, but usually assumed to be even larger at ∼6 kpc (Humphreys et al. 1989; Groh et al. 2009a; Stahl et al. 2001) based on its radial velocity and reddening. This would make it ∼45 pc away from any O star as projected on the sky, and at a larger heliocentric distance than many of the surrounding O stars. This distance, however, may be wrong if AG Car has substantial peculiar motion. In any case, it is much more isolated than expected for a 100 $M_{\odot}$ star.

HR Car: This LBV has only one O-type star projected on the sky within 10 pc, and only a few more within 100 pc, all of which are late-type O stars. The nearest massive clusters (projected on the sky) are in the Carina Nebula and Wd1, both of which are well over 100 pc away and at different distances. With a presumed initial mass of ∼35 $M_{\odot}$, HR Car is therefore surprisingly isolated.

HD 160529 and MWC 930: These LBVs are also surprisingly isolated for their luminosity, being found 50-100 pc from any other O star, and not near any massive cluster. The nearest O stars are all late-type O stars that are also relatively isolated.

R110, R81, R71, & MWC112: These LBVs are all in the category of relatively low-luminosity LBVs, sometimes assumed to be post-RSGs (see Smith et al. 2004). Their luminosities suggest initial masses of 25-40 $M_{\odot}$ when inferred from single-star evolution tracks (Table 1). None of these is in a cluster or association, and in fact each is ∼100 pc or more from any known O-type star. R81 is about 100 pc from a small cluster of O-type stars, and the others have one or two isolated late-O stars as the nearest one. R110 and MWC112 are interestingly near to one another on the sky. R71 is particularly isolated, with not a single O-type star in the entire plotted window (∼300 pc away) in Fig. 2.

R40: Located in the SMC, R40 is not a member of any known OB association. It is very isolated, located ∼120 pc from any other O-type star. Based on its luminosity, it should have an initial mass of 30-35 $M_{\odot}$. The lack of any O stars within more than 100 pc is therefore quite surprising.

In summary, we find that over half the known LBVs are isolated from other massive stars. Of the group discussed above, some of the most luminous classic LBVs are 10s of pc from any other O-type stars, and many of the "low-luminosity" (still quite massive stars with initial masses of 30-40 $M_{\odot}$) LBVs are 100 pc or more from any other O-type star. This degree of isolation is extreme.

While there can be a selection bias against finding fainter O-type stars near very bright LBVs if they are very distant and reddened (this is why we have excluded known LBVs with very high reddening such as those in the Galactic center), there is no conceivable bias that would prevent one from recognizing bright LBVs in known star clusters. While there are a couple LBVs in clusters, the avoidance of young clusters by a majority of LBVs is a robust result. It seems highly unlikely that any unobscured massive young clusters surrounding these LBVs have escaped detection, since they have been studied with deep high contrast imaging to search for nebulosity, as noted earlier. Moreover, we do indeed see late O type stars around some LBVs, but it is the early-type O stars (i.e. the more easily detected ones) that are missing. The lack of brighter early O-type stars cannot be a detection bias when fainter late O-type stars are clearly detected. A general conclusion, then, is that LBVs are either extremely isolated from other O stars, or in cases where there are O stars nearby, those O stars are consistent with a substantially lower main-sequence turn-off mass than what we expect for the LBV ($M_{\rm eff}$ in Table 1). A key qualitative conclusion is that LBVs must either live longer than allowed by single-star models appropriate for their luminosity, or they must have selectively traveled far from their birthsites (or both). The next section shows that this conclusion holds quantitatively and is even more clear when we examine a sample of LBVs that are all at the same distance from us in the Magellanic Clouds.

2.2 Statistical Distributions

In this section we quantify the association (or lack thereof) between LBVs and other massive stars by examining the cumulative distribution of their projected separations on the sky. For this statistical analysis, we focus on the LBVs in the LMC (and the SMC, although there are only 2 LBVs and 1 LBV candidate there). We cannot use the population of LBVs in the MW for this analysis, because the MW is plagued by uncertainties in distance along the line of sight, as well as uncertain extinction in sightlines through the disk. This is problematic where O stars and LBVs along the same line of sight might not actually be related in 3D space, and where reddening and extinction may introduce serious selection effects that would strongly bias a statistical analysis. These effects are minimized in the LMC and SMC, where all the stars are at roughly the same distance, and where we are not looking along the plane of a disk.

2.2.1 Constructing the Cumulative Distribution Plots

The results of our analysis are shown in Figs. 4 and 5, which present the cumulative distribution of projected separations on the sky between various types of massive stars and O-type stars. First, we compiled a list of all O-type stars within 10° of 30 Dor as listed in SIMBAD. We then calculated the projected separation on the sky between every O star and its nearest neighboring O star of any subtype, as well as the second-nearest. Fig. 4 shows cumulative distributions of this separation for the nearest O star; Fig. 5 is the same but for the second nearest. (The significance of adding the second-nearest O-type star is discussed below.) The O stars are broken into 3 bins for: (1) early O-type stars (green; O5



Figure 4. Cumulative distribution plot illustrating the differing degrees of isolation among various classes of massive stars in the LMC; the top and bottom plots are the same, except that the bottom has the separation plotted on a log scale. Classes of objects that are more clustered with young O-type stars appear farther to the left. The relative "isolation" is represented here by the distribution of distances to the nearest O-type star (a plot with projected distances to the second-nearest O-type star looks very similar; Fig. 5). For each star in each category, we calculated the projected separation on the sky in degrees between that individual star and any O-type star (any spectral or luminosity class). Drawn from SIMBAD (except for the LBVs and sgB[e]s), the sample includes all O-type stars, WR stars, LBVs, sgB[e] stars, and RSGs within a 10° projected radius of 30 Dor (except for the SMC stars; see text). The O stars are further subdivided into early (O5 and earlier; green), mid (O6+O7, orange), and late (O8+O9, cyan) subtypes (these correspond to the same colors of plotting symbols in Figures 1, 2, and 3. For WR stars, we show WC stars (magenta), a collection of all WN stars including WNH stars (solid blue), as well as WN stars without WNH (dashed blue). The mustard dot-dashed line is for all H-poor WR stars (WN+WC). For LBVs, we include both LMC and SMC targets (the sparation of the three SMC targets has been multiplied by 1.2 to adjust for the difference in distance), and we include both confirmed and candidate LBVs (see Table 1). RSGs (red) are stars with spectral types later than K3 and luminosity classes of I, Ia, or Iab, and the supergiant B[e] sample (cyan dashed) is from the literature (Bonanos et al. 2009; Zickgraf 2006).



Figure 5. Same as Figure 4, but for the projected separation to the *second*-nearest O-type star (hence the "2").

and earlier with any luminosity class), (2) for mid O-type stars (orange; O6-O7 with any luminosity class), and (3) late O-type stars (cyan; O8-O9 of any luminosity class).

Figs. 4 and 5 reproduce the entirely expected result that the earliest O star spectral types, corresponding to the initially most massive stars, are more highly concentrated than all other types of massive stars (*this group is also the most significant for this study, because it is the early O-type stars that are usually presumed to be the most likely progenitors of LBVs*). Mid and late O-type stars have their distributions skewed progressively to the right, mainly because these stars have longer lifetimes than early O-type stars. The most massive O-type stars die first, while clusters and associations spatially disperse with time due to random motions of stars. Therefore, on average, for progressively later O-type stars one must travel farther before encountering another O-type star, matching the distributions in Figs. 4 and 5.

Fig. 4 provides a handy indication that massive stars are born preferentially in clusters, and that the relative concentration increases with mass: almost 90% of early O-type stars are found within 10 pc of another O star, and for later O-types, about 2/3 are within 10 pc of another O star. This average separation increases as stars age.

Next, we did the same analysis for WR stars, supergiant B[e] stars (or sgB[e]), RSGs, and LBVs. For each, we calculated the separation between a given star and the nearest O-type star, as well as the second nearest. LMC WR stars within 10° of the position of the R136 cluster were re-

trieved from SIMBAD, and were separated into WC stars (magenta), and WN stars (both with and without H indicated in their classification; dashed blue and solid blue, respectively). We also show all H-free WR stars (mustard dot-dashed line) in the figures. The sample of sgB[e] stars includes only 12 objects in the LMC (Bonanos et al. 2009; Zickgraf 2006). For RSGs (red), we included all stars of spectral types later than K3 and luminosity classes of I, Ia, or Iab as listed in SIMBAD for the same 10° radius around 30 Dor. The LBVs correspond to the LBVs and LBV candidates in the LMC and SMC from Table 1. (For the LBVs in the SMC, we obviously compiled a separate list of O stars in the SMC, and adjusted the projected separation by ∼20% to correct for the SMC's larger distance.)

2.2.2 WR Stars

For WR stars, Figs. 4 and 5 reveal the expected general result that they are more dispersed than O-type stars. Naively, this should be the case because the chemical compositions of WR stars require them to be post-main-sequence objects. The mustard-colored dot-dash line shows all WR stars excluding WNH stars, which appear shifted to the right compared to all O-type stars (grey dashed).

Next, we consider WR subtypes. Examining WN stars with and without H in their spectra, we find that WN and WNH stars have quite similar distibutions, except that a tail of very tightly clustered objects less than 1 pc from an O star are all WNH (even more clustered than later O-type stars); this is also not surprising if WNH stars are actually the late core-H burning phases of the most massive O-type stars (see, e.g., Smith & Conti 2008 or Crowther 2007 and references therein). WC stars are more spatially dispersed than WN stars. While about half of WN stars are within 10 pc of an O-type star, less than 10% of WC stars are within 10 pc of an O-type star.

The difference between WN and WC is actually quite interesting. Based only on their locations that are more dispersed from O-star clusters than WN stars, one would conclude that WC stars either originate from preferentially *lower* initial masses than the progenitors of WN stars, or that WC stars are substantially older and correspond to a more advanced stage in the same evolutionary path that occurs after most WN stars. This relative distribution is inconsistent with WC stars originating from selectively higher initial masses than most WNs, since H + He burning lifetimes of the most massive stars are not long enough to migrate 90% of the population so far away from neighboring O-type stars. Stellar evolution models with strong stellar-wind mass loss that are able to produce WR stars from single-star evolution make some predictions that are inconsistent with these results, even ignoring LBVs (discussed next). With or without including rapid rotation, single-star models typically expect WC stars to arise from the most massive stars (e.g., Georgy et al. 2012; Heger et al. 2003). If H-free WR stars descend from the most massive main-sequence stars, then models predict that the time from birth to the latter half of the WR phase is only about 3-4 Myr. This corresponds to the H burning main sequence lifetimes of mid O-type stars. If WC stars result from the strongest winds from the initially most massive stars, then WC stars should show a typical separation from other O-type stars that is comparable to middle or late O-type stars of the same absolute age. Unless there are severe selection effects that prevent the identification of WC stars in clusters, the isolation of WC stars in Figs. 4 and 5 would seem to falsify one of the central ideas of single-star evolution models. This deserves more attention and modeling of cluster dispersal as a function of delay time distributions, which is beyond the scope here. As we will see next, LBVs make things even worse for single-star evolution models.

2.2.3 LBVs

A very unexpected result — and perhaps the most significant empirical finding in this paper — is that LBVs are *even more* isolated than WR stars. The distribution of separations from LBVs to the nearest O star is skewed significantly to the right as compared to WN stars, and comparable to (but apparently even somewhat more isolated) than WC stars.[4] This is important, because it cannot be reconciled with the standard paradigm of massive single-star evolution (see below), wherein LBVs are an intermediate evolutionary phase between massive O stars and WR stars. The distribution of separations between LBVs and the nearest neighboring O-type stars is shown by the black solid histogram in Fig. 4, and to the second-nearest O star in Fig. 5. Both plots yield similar results. The implications of this relative isolation of LBVs are discussed more below.

We include two different plots showing the distributions of separations to the nearest O star and to the second-nearest O star, because this provides independent information, and helps mitigate the influence of incompleteness in the O star sample. It also provides additional information about how clustered the nearest O stars are, and hence, quantitative indication that LBVs avoid clusters. In general, if massive stars are all in clusters, then Fig. 4 and 5 should be basically the same but with everything skewed by a small amount to the right in Fig. 5. This is true for most types of stars, but looking closely, one can see that LBVs actually "pull away" from O stars and WR stars when looking at the second-nearest O star. This tells us something important about the O stars that are the nearest neighbors of LBVs — i.e. that *they are relatively isolated too*. Most O stars are in clusters, and so the second-nearest neighbors of most massive stars are also in clusters. However, the fact that LBVs pull away in Fig. 5 means that the nearest neighboring O-type star to an LBV is typically not in a cluster, but is itself a relatively isolated O star (this may indicate that a number of these are chance projections).

Using the distributions of separations from O stars for the various classes shown in Figs. 4 and 5, we performed Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) tests to quantify the statistical significance of these separations. Table 2 shows the results, with the KS test P-value for the distributions of separations to the nearest (P1) and second-nearest (P2) O-type star.

[4] Note that the distributions for LBVs and all types of WR stars converge at the largest separations around 0.3 deg or ∼300 pc. This merely reflects the fact that within a few degrees around 30 Dor, the surface density of late O-type stars (see Fig. 2) is such that one cannot travel very far without having a chance alignment with an O-type star.

Each line in the table compares LBVs to that class of star. We see that there is basically no chance that LBVs and any O-type stars are drawn from the same parent population. The P-values for WR stars are quite interesting. For P2, we find a strong indication that LBVs are not drawn from the same population as all WR stars together, WNH stars, or WN stars (all these are less than 5%), and we find a reasonable probability that LBVs and WC stars have the same parent distribution of separations. For P1, LBVs and WNH stars are clearly different, all WR stars and WN stars show weaker probably of being from different parent distributions, whereas WC stars are again consistent with LBVs. The lifetimes and temporal sequences in standard single-star evolutionary models don't match these observed distributions of the majority of massive stars. In those models, LBVs are transitional objects between O stars and WN stars, and so LBVs should have a spatial distribution on the sky that is intermediate between these two. Instead, LBVs seem most similar to WC stars, which must occur much later in the single-star evolutionary sequence, and which have very different chemical composition. Thus, the idea that the initially most massive O-type stars evolve to become LBVs and then pass on to become WN stars followed by WC stars is ruled out with high confidence, based on where they reside.

Selection effects are a concern in any cumulative distribution plot, so one can ask what would be needed to make LBVs appear where they "should be" (between O stars and WN stars) in Figs. 4 and 5. For this, we would need an additional number of LBVs equal to all those LBVs and LBV candidates currently known, but all these extra LBVs would need to reside in young massive star clusters and to have escaped detection. For any turnoff mass, LBVs will be much brighter at visual wavelengths than O-type stars of the same bolometric luminosity because they are cooler. As such, LBVs would be the brightest stars in any such cluster, so having a large number escape detection seems impossible.

Some LBVs have Ofpe/WN9 spectral types when they are in their quiescent hot phase, but we see that LBVs have a statistically different distribution of separations from O stars as compared to WN stars with H. This seems to indicate that the population of WN stars with H in their spectra is a mixed bag that may include stars in very different evolutionary stages. Clarifying this is left to future work.

It is quite possible that the census of O-type stars in the MCs is not 100% complete, but this cannot invalidate our results concerning LBVs. If a more detailed census were to reveal new O-type stars in the field of the LMC, one would expect the cumulative distribution of LBV separations in Figures 4 and 5 to move to the left, because some of the LBVs would have a closer O-star neighbor than before. However, we have compared the WR stars to *the same population of O-type stars*, so they would move to the left too (and the distribution of O stars themselves would get tighter). Thus, the critical result that LBVs are more dispersed on the sky than WR stars would remain. The only way an incomplete census of O stars would change the result would be if undetected O stars are preferentially located very close to LBVs and not close to other types of evolved stars, which brings us back to the the point above that LBVs would need to reside in clusters of O stars that have gone undetected despite deep high contrast imaging.

Table 2. KS tests comparing LBV separation distributions to those of other star types.

Type	P1	P2
early O	5.5e-9	7.4e-8
mid O	1.4e-7	1.1e-6
late O	4.4e-6	1.2e-5
WR (WN+WC)	0.072	0.024
WN+WNH	0.0095	0.0093
WN	0.057	0.036
WC	0.54	0.33
sgB[e]	0.12	0.22
RSG	0.00077	0.0055

Notes:
P1 = KS P-value for separations to the nearest O star.
P2 = KS P-value for separations to the second-nearest O star.

2.2.4 RSGs and sgB[e]

Unsurprisingly, RSGs are the most isolated from O-type stars among the evolved massive stars plotted here. RSGs arise from stars of initial masses of ∼10-30 $M_{\odot}$, but by number the population is dominated by the lower end of this range where stars have long lifetimes of around 20-100 Myr. The fact that LBVs are clearly to the left of RSGs on Figs. 4 and 5 therefore indicates that most LBV initial masses are (very roughly) above 12-15 $M_{\odot}$.

Somewhat more interesting is that the supergiant B[e] stars (sgB[e]) in the LMC (dashed cyan) have a spatial distribution on the sky that appears very similar to that of RSGs. We used the positions for the 12 sgB[e] stars known in the LMC (Bonanos et al. 2009; Zickgraf 2006), and their separations to the nearest and second nearest O-type stars are shown along with the other types of stars in Figs. 4 and 5. A KS test comparing the distributions of sgB[e] stars to RSGs in the LMC reveals P1 and P2 values of 0.49 and 0.89 respectively (not shown in Table 2), indicating a high probability that for these two classes of evolved stars, the spatial distributions relative to O-type stars are drawn from the same population. A KS test gives a somewhat weaker indication that sgB[e] stars and LBVs are drawn from the same distribution (the P1 and P2 values comparing LBVs to sgB[e] stars are given in Table 2). The sgB[e] stars look more isolated than LBVs in Figures 4 and 5, but their low numbers (only 12 in the LMC) make a statistically significant determination difficult. Although the luminosities of the most luminous sgB[e] stars overlap with the lower luminosity LBVs (see, e.g., Figure 6), their distribution of luminosities is skewed lower than LBVs. Given these considerations, it seems quite likely that the sgB[e] stars are the evolutionary analogs of LBVs at somewhat lower initial mass (e.g., where the results of instability may be less violent). This is discussed more below.

2.3 Summary of LBV Environments

The large fraction of LBVs that appear isolated should sound alarm bells for anyone familiar with the traditional view of LBVs as "massive stars in transition", just having finished core-H burning and soon moving on to He burning as WR stars. Upon comparing positions of O-type stars

to the coordinates of known LBVs, the result is astonishing. Basically, *LBVs systematically avoid clusters of O-type stars, and they are rarely associated with O-type stars of similar (presumed) initial mass*. This is the opposite of what is expected in the standard paradigm of massive star evolution where LBVs are the immediate descendants of the most massive O stars, and the predecessors of luminous WR stars. Figs. 4 and 5 indicate that the vast majority of O-type stars are indeed in highly clustered environments. WR stars are significantly more dispersed, consistent with their more evolved status. LBVs should be intermediate between O stars and WR stars, but in fact they are more isolated than WR stars. This requires that they are older, on average, than WR stars, which in turn implies that they arise either from lower initial masses (longer core-H burning lifetimes), that they are a more advanced evolutionary state than WR stars (improbable based on chemical composition), or that some mechanism has systematically removed them from clusters without disturbing other massive stars.

Initial masses implied by LBV environments differ considerably from other inferences about their likely initial masses based primarily on turnoff masses and ages of nearby stars. (Actually, there have been very few studies of the ages and masses of LBVs based on their environments, perhaps reflecting the fact that many of them are not in clusters where this is usually done.) η Car is located in the Tr16 cluster. Tr16 is inferred to have an age of $\sim$3 Myr, which is, however, based largely on the fact that η Car itself has not yet gone SN. Excluding η Car, Tr16 has a turnoff mass of roughly 80-100 $M_\odot$, which is significantly below the presumed initial mass of η Car itself — although perhaps consistent enough that it does not immediately raise questions, due to the similar main-sequence lifetimes of very massive stars at $\gtrsim$100 $M_\odot$. Based on studying OB associations in the LMC/SMC and adopting characteristic turnoff masses for the earliest O-type stars in each, Massey et al. (2000) inferred initial masses of LBVs and WR stars. They favored an initial mass of >85 $M_\odot$ for the two LBVs in their study (S Dor and R85), and high initial masses for WR stars as well (>70 $M_\odot$ in the SMC, and 30-60 $M_\odot$ in the LMC). There are, however, two key effects that compromise this method of determining initial masses: (1) It requires that the cluster or association is coeval, but many of the regions studied have large age spreads compared to the lifetimes of very massive stars. For example, the association LH41 in which S Dor and R85 reside has a very large age spread; while its most luminous members do suggest a turnoff mass around 85 $M_\odot$ by comparison to single-star evolutionary tracks, this same association also contains cool supergiants with initial masses of only 10-15 $M_\odot$ (Massey et al. 2000). (2) This method ignores important effects of binary evolution that corrupt the inferred turnoff mass (see, e.g., Larsen et al. 2011). Both binary mass transfer and binary mergers will produce luminous stars that repopulate the upper main sequence (e.g., Langer & Kudritzki 2014; Langer 2012; Schneider et al. 2014; de Mink et al. 2014). When compared to isochrones of single-star evolutionary models, these massive blue stragglers will imply an age younger than the true age of the cluster, and will overestimate the main-sequence turnoff mass. Convolved with an age spread due to star formation that may be comparable to teh lifetimes of massive stars, this makes it difficult to use cluster turnoffs to estimate the initial masses of the most luminous evolved stars.

Looking at the spatial relationship between LBVs and other massive stars gives an independent and quantitative check on relative ages that does not have the same pitfalls as cluster turnoffs. If we assume that the vast majority of massive stars form in clusters (indeed they do, as O-type stars are observed to be highly clustered in Figure 4), then as the most massive stars explode early and the cluster spreads out due to random motions, the distribution of distances to a nearest neighboring O-type star must slowly and steadily increase with age. This method has no reliance on uncertain input physics of stellar evolution models or their neglect of binaries. It does not give a precise absolute age, but it does provide a reliable measure of the *relative* ages of different populations of massive stars. This method produces a very different result from cluster turnoffs (Massey et al. 2000).

The relative isolation of LBVs is apparent in the MW as well as the LMC/SMC, although only the LMC/SMC produce a meaningful statistical analysis due to distance and reddening uncertainties in the MW. If there were only a few isolated LBVs, it wouldn't be so troubling because we might expect a few cases where the LBV was initially the most massive star in a small cluster that contains no other O-type stars. Indeed, a few percent of O stars (mostly late O-type stars) appear to have been born in relative isolation (e.g., Fig. 4 and Oey et al. 2013) — but $\sim$90% of early O-type stars *are* in clusters. LBVs are the opposite: only rare exceptions are found in clusters (η Car and R127) and most of them are either in loose associations with large age spreads, or they are found 10s or even 100s of pc from other O-type stars. This isolation requires that LBVs are either very massive stars that for some reason were preferentially born well outside clusters (hard to justify physically), or that they have lived longer than we expect based on single-star evolution and have systematically moved away from their birth environments. This cannot be reconciled with the traditional view of LBVs in single-star evolution.

3 STANDARD VIEW: LBVS AS THE TRANSITIONAL DESCENDANTS OF MASSIVE SINGLE O-TYPE STARS

As noted in the introduction, the current standard paradigm of massive-star evolution is that single massive O-type stars evolve into H-deficient WR stars by virtue of their own radiation-driven mass loss. For all but the most luminous and most massive stars (i.e. $\gtrsim$100 $M_\odot$) that pass through a strong-winded WNH phase, accounting for clumping effects indicates that line-driven stellar winds are too weak to accomplish this (see Smith 2014 and references therein). Thus, if LBVs are presumed to fit into the evolutionary sequence of single stars:

O star $\rightarrow$ Of/WNH $\rightarrow$ LBV $\rightarrow$ WN $\rightarrow$ WC $\rightarrow$ SN Ibc,

then enhanced eruptive LBV mass loss would be essential in order for single massive O-type stars to become WR stars (Smith & Owocki 2006). In this scenario, the LBV phase is a very brief, fleeting transitional phase (see, e.g., Lamers & Nugis 2002; Groh et al. 2014). In evolutionary models, there is little time ($\sim 10^5$ yr) after the end of core-H burning and before the onset of the WR phase when a star



Figure 6. HR Diagram comparing LBVs and model evolutionary tracks. The LBVs plotted here are the same as in Smith et al. (2004), except that the upper range is expanded to include η Car, IRAS 18576+0341 (AFGL 2298) has been updated (Clark et al. 2009), and both MWC 930 and R85 have been added. Miroshnichenko et al. (2014) have claimed that the Galactic star MWC 930 is now a confirmed LBV, and Massey et al. (2000) have argued that R85 in the LMC should be counted as an LBV. The evolutionary tracks are from Figure 4a in Langer & Kudritzki (2014), although as they note, the single-star tracks up to 60 $M_{\odot}$ are originally from Brott et al. (2011). The blue dotted tracks are single-star evolution tracks for $Z_{\odot}$ and an initial rotation speed of 100 km s^{-1}. The solid blue and red tracks are for a binary system that undergoes RLOF on the main sequence, with an initially 16 $M_{\odot}$ mass donor and an initially 14 $M_{\odot}$ secondary mass gainer. This illustrates just one example of how a star that initially has a relatively low mass can end up as a much more luminous star that could resemble the low-luminosity LBVs; binary systems with higher initial masses might obviously populate the more luminous LBVs in a similar manner. For reference, the approximate locations of supergiant B[e] stars and BSGs are shown, as are the progenitor of SN 1987A and the putative companion of SN 1993J's progenitor (Maund et al. 2004; Fox et al. 2014).

can be an LBV. In this short time interval, stars cannot move very far, and so LBVs are expected to have a spatial distribution on the sky that is very similar to the O stars that are supposedly their immediate progenitors. For a typical velocity dispersion in a cluster of a few km s^{-1}, a single star will move less than ∼10 pc in 3 Myr, and much less than 1 pc in 10^5 yr. Therefore, if early O-type stars are mostly in clusters (they are; see Figs. 4 and 5), then their immediate single-star descendants must be as well. In Fig. 4, the cumulative distribution of LBV separations should therefore be in between O-type stars and WN stars, and LBVs should be much more clustered than WC stars. In this paper we have

shown that the opposite is true – that LBVs are surprisingly isolated from O stars. Most critically, observations indicate that in terms of their separation from O-type stars, *LBVs are even more isolated than WR stars (both WN and WC).*

The observed population of LBVs therefore cannot evolve into the observed population of WR stars, because LBVs would need to turn around and systematically move back toward clusters and associations in order to match the locations of WR stars. This cannot be. The standard view of LBVs as single "massive stars in transition" is incompatible with observations of their locations, and must no longer be considered as a viable evolutionary scenario for the majority of massive stars. This rules out the monotonic evolutionary paradigm outlined above, making it difficult for single massive stars to become H-poor WR stars and SNe Ibc (because without LBV mass loss, their winds aren't strong enough). Most often, the LBV phase must play a different role. A straightforward alternative is discussed next.

4 ALTERNATIVE: MASS GAINERS IN RLOF

The fact that LBVs are more isolated than WR stars, plus the fact that some stars appear to remain in an LBV phase until death as SNe IIn (see Smith 2014 for a review), suggests an entirely different picture. Instead of the monotonic evolutionary scheme for single stars discussed above, the spatial distributions discussed in this paper suggest that massive star populations and especially LBVs are dominated by bifurcated evolutionary trajectories:

$$\text{O star} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{WN} \rightarrow \text{WC} \rightarrow \text{SNIbc} & \text{(donor)} \\ \text{LBV/B[e]} \rightarrow \text{SNIIn} & \text{(gainer)} \end{cases}.$$

In this scenario, O-type stars evolve off the main sequence, and through binary interaction the majority of massive stars either (1) lose their H envelope through mass transfer to a companion, become WR stars and die as stripped-envelope SNe, or (2) gain mass from a companion, become BSGs, sgB[e]s, and LBVs, and then retain their H envelopes until they die as SNe IIn. After the mass transfer phase, the subsequent evolution of the mass gainer may be quite varied, and so not all mass gainers will necessarily be LBVs and SNe IIn.[5] In an insightful early paper, Kenyon & Gallagher (1985) discussed the fact that a few of the Hubble-Sandage variables in M31 appeared relatively isolated, and they suggested a similar binary mass-transfer scenario for these, while still favoring a single-star evolutionary scheme for most LBVs. Here, we show that the environments of *most* LBVs violate the single-star picture, not just a few exceptions. Instead of LBVs being a brief transitional phase for all very massive stars, they become the dominant late evolutionary phase for a subset of massive binaries. LBVs are rare enough that the fraction of stars which do this and for how long they remain in the LBV phase is poorly constrained observationally. (Note that when the oversimplified, monotonic evolutionary scheme is abandoned, the number ratio of LBVs to O-type stars offers no meaningful constraint on the LBV duration without additional information.)

Fig. 6 shows the locations of LBVs on the HR diagram, mostly taken from Smith et al. (2004), except as noted in the caption. The locations of LBVs are compared to standard evolutionary tracks for single stars, and also to an example of an evolutionary track for an interacting binary system from Langer & Kudritzki (2014). Using single-star evolution tracks as a reference, the initial masses of LBVs would appear to range from 30-40 $M_\odot$ for the lower-L LBVs, and from 50-250 $M_\odot$ or more for the classical high-luminosity LBVs.[6] A main point of our paper is that the isolated environments of LBVs are incompatible with the short lifetimes experienced by stars with such high initial mass, and they are incompatible with the key idea that most LBVs continue their evolution to WR stars.

Instead, ascribing LBVs as the mass gainers in interacting binaries provides an attractive and plausible alternative. As noted earlier, the plausibility of this basic idea was mentioned long ago (Gallagher 1989), but did not become the dominant view. Through the process of RLOF, the mass gainer can substantially increase its mass and luminosity to resemble a star that had an initially much higher mass. One example is shown in Fig. 6, where a star with an initial mass of 14 $M_\odot$ accretes mass in a binary and ends up with a luminosity commensurate with a $\sim$26 $M_\odot$ star (Langer & Kudritzki 2014). It is easy to see that such an evolutionary path could, in principle, give rise to the low-luminosity group of LBVs. Similarly, somewhat more massive stars in binaries (initial masses of 30-40 $M_\odot$), could accrete mass to appear as 60-80 $M_\odot$ classical LBVs. One can imagine higher mass analogs of this that could correspond to the classical LBVs like AG Car and R127.

A crucial point is that this mass accretion and corresponding increase in luminosity may occur after a long delay, after both stars in the binary system have lived through much or all of their H-core burning main-sequence lifetimes. As initially lower mass stars, their core-H burning lifetimes may be much longer than the main-sequence lifetime expected for the more massive star that they become. As such, a mass gainer may appear younger than the population of stars around it. In cases where the discrepancy between the initial mass and $M_{\rm eff}$ is close to a factor of 2, the lifetime can be doubled for moderately massive stars (15-30 $M_\odot$). For example, the approximate lifetimes of single stars of 15 and 30 $M_\odot$ initial mass are about 14 and 6.5 Myr, respectively (Woosley et al. 2002). If LBVs fit this role, then they are essentially evolved massive blue stragglers, not massive stars in transition. LBVs originating this way may help solve a number of issues that have been problematic for a single-star scenario:

1. As noted above, the mass gainer will have a longer age than expected for its current mass and luminosity, helping

[5] For example, in some studies, the spun-up mass gainers are assumed to undergo quasi-homogeneous chemical evolution and die as H-free WR stars and possibly gammay ray bursts (GRBs), as described by (Eldridge et al. 2011). This is discussed more in Section 5. In some cases the evolution can be quite complicated, if for example, multiple episodes of mass transfer or late mergers occur. This may be important for some fraction of massive stars.

[6] Note that the values of $M_{\rm eff}$ we infer from Figure 6 are approximate. Values of the luminosity depend on the analysis technique used for each star and the distance assumed, and there are multiple values available in the literature for several LBVs (see, e.g., Groh et al. 2009a).

to rectify the isolation of LBVs discussed in this paper and the initial mass discrepancy.

2. In addition to becoming more massive and more luminous, the mass gainer will also gain angular momentum during RLOF. This may cause LBVs to appear as rapid rotators late in life. A number of LBVs do exhibit properties consistent with rapid rotation (Smith 2002; Smith et al. 2003b; Groh et al. 2009b, 2006). Moreover, rotation has been inferred to be quite important in some ideas about LBV instability (Langer 1998). In a single-star scenario, it is difficult to understand how they can shed large amounts of mass in steady winds while retaining their angular momentum. Single-star models generally predict negligible rotational speeds for the LBV phase (Groh et al. 2014; Meynet & Maeder 2003). This scenario also implies that a large fraction of the fast runaway stars that are kicked out of clusters by their companion's SN will be these rapidly rotating mass gainers (i.e. there must be a fair number of them to account for the observed distribution of LBVs). It is not clear yet if this is the case, but further study of this may provide an important test.

3. RLOF or other binary interaction may produce very asymmetric CSM, as seen around many LBVs with bipolar or elliptical nebulae (η Car, AG Car, HR Car, HD 168625, etc.). Using spectropolarimetry, equatorial distributions of CSM around SNe IIn have also been inferred (Mauerhan et al. 2014; Hoffman et al. 2008; Leonard et al. 2000). Some of the more extreme observed asymmetries in the CSM may be difficult to achieve with single stars.

4. Removing the restriction that LBVs must transition into H-poor WR stars before they die, mass gainers might retain some of their H envelopes until death. This would reconcile the problem of LBVs exploding as SNe IIn.

5. The mass gained from a more evolved companion may be significantly enriched in nitrogen. This by itself does not necessarily argue against a single-star scenario if efficient mixing can bring N to the star's surface (Lamers et al. 2001), but the N-enriched nebulae around LBVs are consistent with N enrichment in a binary mass-gainer scenario.

6. Similarly, the accretion of enriched material from a companion could help explain why LBV relative H/He abundances are similar to those of WN stars with H (actually between those of very luminous WNH stars and other WN stars with H; Smith & Conti 2008; Langer et al. 1994), even though their locations on the sky are very different.

7. When their stripped-envelope companion explodes as a SN Ibc or IIb, the mass-gainer star is likely to receive a kick. This provides an attractive explanation for why LBVs would preferentially and systematically seem to avoid star clusters, and adds to their longer lifetimes in explaining their observed isolation. Even if they are born in clusters and live in associations for several Myr, they may get kicked out of the cluster. Because the initially more massive star will usually explode first, the kicked mass gainer may have a few more Myr to live after that SN event. Traveling at 50-100 km s^{-1}, the star can move about 50-100 pc in 1 Myr. Such motion for only 1-2 Myr is therefore sufficient to explain the relative isolation of most of the LBVs discussed here. It is important to recognize that the mass gainer may not exhibit the LBV instability immediately upon accreting mass, but is likely to do so in its own time when it finishes core-H burning and evolves to become a supergiant. (In the mean time, it will be a much hotter O-type star that is fainter in visual light; thus, we would not expect bright LBVs to be seen at the positions of most SNe Ibc, because it may take them another 10^6 yr to evolve into their own supergiant phase.) The delayed onset of the LBV phase may lead them to preferentially appear outside clusters. Depending on how long it takes them to die, this may also lead SN impostor eruptions and the eventual SNe IIn to appear isolated.

8. Even if they are a product of binary evolution, LBVs may appear as single stars if their companion has already exploded. In some cases, of course, the close companion may not have exploded yet. If they were born in triple systems, they may still be in binaries.

9. In the MW, LMC/SMC, and in other nearby galaxies, there is a large population of massive stars that resemble LBVs but that have not yet exhibited the eruptive LBV instability. These are usually called "LBV candidates" as noted earlier. Massey et al. (2007) find an order of magnitude more LBV candidates than bona fide LBVs in nearby galaxies, and massive dusty shells around massive stars in the MW suggest a similarly large number here (Wachter et al. 2010; Gvaramadze et al. 2010). Counting only LBVs, their small number compared to O-type stars has been used to justify a very brief transitional phase (e.g., Humphreys & Davidson 1994) before becoming a WR star. However, if LBV candidates are included in the count, the implied LBV lifetime becomes much longer (see Smith 2014 and references therein). In the bifurcated evolutionary scheme discussed above, the post main-sequence lifetime of the H-rich mass gainer is much longer than the LBV phase envisioned in single-star models, allowing LBV candidates to be the same stars as LBVs, if the LBV eruptive instability is only active for part of that time or in a subset of circumstances.

In addition to mass accretion through RLOF, stellar mergers or more exotic systems such as blue Thorne-Zytkow-like objects (TZOs) might also yield some of the same results that are compatible with observed properties of LBVs (overluminous or young compared to surrounding stars, rapid rotators, enriched and asymmetric CSM, etc).[7] The role of mergers in producing asymmetric CSM, in particular, has been discussed extensively (see review by Podsiadlowski 2010 and references therein). Theoretical predictions for TZOs are highly uncertain, and it remains difficult to rule out the possibility that some LBVs are merger products or blue TZOs, especially those that may still be in clusters or associations. However, lacking a significant kick from a companion's SN, stellar mergers do not offer a compelling explanation for why the larger population of LBVs seem to systematically avoid clusters.

So, what about the fates of single stars or binaries that merge early on the main sequence? If LBVs are exclusively or

[7] TZOs are normally expected to be red (Thorn & Zytkow 1975, 1977). However, at the high luminosities appropriate for LBVs ($\sim 10^6\ L_\odot$), RSGs do not exist. Very luminous shell burning stars that would otherwise be luminous RSGs are thought to reside in the blue because of mass loss and instability in their outer envelopes. The same might apply to the envelopes of TZOs in this high-luminosity range, if they exist. This is still speculative, but we mention it because blue TZOs cannot be ruled out for LBVs without more detailed study.

mostly a binary phenomenon, then it becomes very unclear if WR stars can arise from single stars. Perhaps RSG mass loss becomes critical. Uncertainties (in most cases overestimates) in mass loss, plus errors in models that have arisen from comparing single-star models to binary populations, prohibit existing evolution models from making unique predictions (again, see Smith 2014). With all known stellar mass black holes in binaries, there are few observational constraints on the end fates (back hole or neutron star; successful exoplosion or quiet collapse) for truly single high-mass stars.

A key conclusion from LBV environments as compared to other types of stars is that while LBVs are indeed very massive stars based on their current high luminosity, they didn't necessarily begin their lives that way. Although this paper advocates a different origin for LBVs than is usually assumed, much of the traditionally discussed phenomena associated with LBVs may still apply. They are still stars with extreme mass loss and instability that have eruptive super-Eddington winds or explosive mass loss (see, e.g., Owocki et al. 2004; Smith et al. 2011a). What is very different in the evolutionary scheme advocated above is the path by which the stars have come to be in their current state. Hence, their initial masses and ages are very different than previously assumed. LBVs have been discussed as a normal transitional state for the most massive stars that have evolved to be in close proximity to the classical Eddington limit. Instead, we argue that in most cases they are stars that have become more luminous, rapidly rotating, and unstable as a consequence of mass accretion in a binary system (or perhaps in some cases something more exotic, such as a merger or blue TZO). Although the scenario suggested here does not solve the overarching mystery of the physical trigger of LBV eruptions, the evolutionary path to arrive at this point may be a critical part of the puzzle (especially where angular momentum and stellar structure are concerned). This remains a challenge for future theoretical work.

A clear message with broader significance is that cluster turnoffs analyzed with single-star model isochrones will systematically underestimate the age and overestimate the turnoff mass of clusters and associations, because the apparent turnoffs are contaminated by massive blue stragglers. This method is especially unreliable for very massive stars, where age spreads in clusters are comparable to their absolute age. Similarly, we must be mindful of SN progenitors and their "initial mass", as discussed next.

5 CONNECTIONS TO SUPERNOVAE AND THEIR HOST ENVIRONMENTS

Evidence presented in recent years has begun to shift our central paradigm of massive star evolution. On the one hand, wind mass-loss rates are lower than we used to think, while the close binary fraction among O-type stars is shown to be quite high (roughly 2/3 are interacting, as noted in the introduction). The isolation of LBVs now seems to require a major shift. The interaction process of RLOF or mergers has a profound impact on the types of evolved stars that are observed, and binarity must therefore also have a strong (or dominant) impact on the distribution of SN subtypes that mark the end fates of these massive stars — perhaps even moreso than metallicity dependent winds and initial mass, as has generally been assumed.

Observed statistics of SN subtypes and other considerations already argue that binary RLOF and not stellar winds must dominate the removal of the H envelope for most stripped-envelope SN progenitors (Smith et al. 2011b), and binary population synthesis studies have suggested this for some time (Podsiadlowski et al. 1992; van Rensbergen et al. 1996; Vanbeveren et al. 1998, 2007; Izzard et al. 2004; Cantiello et al. 2007; de Mink et al. 2007; Eldridge et al. 2008). There are too many SNe Ibc and IIb than there are stars initially massive enough to remove their H envelopes via their own winds. Including SNe IIb, the fraction of core-collapse SNe that have stripped-envelope progenitors is ∼36%, whereas stars that are luminous enough to shed their H envelopes through their own winds comprise only 10-15% of a normal SN-producing IMF (Smith et al. 2011b), or perhaps even less if some massive stars collapse to black holes without producing bright SNe. Interestingly, from the fraction of O stars that will interact and exchange mass, Sana et al. (2012) estimate that 1/3 is the approximate fraction of massive stars that we might expect to lose their H envelope in RLOF. Comparing this 33% to the observed value of 36% of ccSNe that have stripped-envelope progenitors, there appears to be little wiggle room to allow massive single stars to die as SNe Ibc. Similar arguments in favor of binary progenitors have been made based on the mass and composition of the ejecta in stripped-envelope SNe (Dessart et al. 2012; Hachinger et al. 2012).

A natural question arises. If binary RLOF strips the H envelope to make most SNe IIb, Ib, and Ic, then what happens to the mass-gainer companions of these stripped-envelope stars? What do those mass-gainer stars look like, and which SNe do they yield? In a theoretical study, Eldridge et al. (2011) assumed that the spun-up mass gainers would experience enhanced rotational mixing and would undergo quasi-homogeneous chemical evolution, suggesting that they would die as H-free WR stars and possibly GRBs. Eldridge et al. (2011) therefore inferred that there may be a population of relatively isolated WR stars and GRBs. In this paper we have argued something different: that LBVs might be the direct products of mass transfer in binaries, and in particular, the mass gainers. (If this is correct, it may suggest that quasi-homogeneous chemical evolution may not be appropriate for these stars, but a further discussion is beyond the scope of this paper.) We have discussed above that this binary scenario alleviates the apparent paradox of LBVs exploding as SNe IIn, which is prohibited in the standard single-star evolution framework (although see Groh et al. 2013 for a possible caveat). If LBVs do indeed explode as SNe IIn, then we should expect the relative isolation of LBVs discussed herein to be reflected in their resulting SNe as well. As noted above, if these stars receive a kick when a companion in the binary system explodes, they may travel 100 pc or more from their birthsites by the time they die. They should die at locations that are preferentially outside clusters, causing them to systematically avoid bright H II regions or blue star clusters. Even without a kick, the extended lifetime of an LBV (because its true initial mass was much lower than its apparent $M_{\rm eff}$) would allow it to live much longer then the H II region that it might have been born in, since the

massive stars that ionized the region may have long since died away.

Evidence consistent with this from observations of SN host environments has already been published in the literature, although the results were interpreted somewhat differently. As noted in the introduction, Anderson and collaborators (Anderson & James 2009; Anderson et al. 2012; Habergham et al. 2014) have found that SN IIn show a weaker association with Hα emission in host galaxies, as compared to SNe Ibc, and their Hα association is more like that of SNe II-P. Those authors interpreted these results in a context where initial mass dominates SN types; they attributed the correlation of SNe Ibc with Hα to indicate the highest range of initial mass, and they interpreted the lack of correlation between SNe IIn and Hα as indicating lower initial masses. They therefore concluded that LBVs are a less likely progenitor channel for SNe IIn.

As we noted earlier, this result motivated us to examine the environments of nearby LBVs. We found that despite their high luminosities and initial masses higher than those of most RSGs, LBVs do actually appear to be very isolated from OB star clusters (moreso than WR stars, and almost as isolated as RSGs). We have argued that this is most likely due to receiving a kick from a companion's SN that preferentially sends the mass gainers flying out of clusters. Binary evolution will have an impact not only on the stars that are kicked (in this case the LBVs and resulting SNe IIn), but also on the mass donors that explode first. They (in this case SNe Ibc or IIb) will occur preferentially in young clusters as compared to other SN types that are found anywhere, and will be anticorrelated with those that are preferentially kicked out of clusters. Thus, assuming that both SNe Ibc and SNe IIn come from a wide range of overlapping initial masses appears to be consistent with the data. Because of the important influence of binary evolution, interpreting SN host invironments only in terms of progenitor initial mass is overly simple.[8] Some stars and certain types of SNe can selectively move from their birthsites; a theoretical study of the delay-time distributions and correlations (or not) with H II regions is needed to quantify this effect.

Moreover, there are reasons why a correlation with Hα as adopted by Anderson and collaborators is not necessarily a reliable indicator of extreme youth and the highest intial masses. That interpretation was criticized by Crowther (2013), who pointed out that the brightest (and therefore the most easily detected H II regions in distant galaxies) are giant H II regions that are actually quite long lived ($\sim$20 Myr), with ages comparable to the ages of stars with initial masses of only $\sim$12 $M_{\odot}$. Anderson and collaborators have based their metric of association with Hα, and hence youth, as flux-depenent, so that a SN landing on a bright source of Hα is interpreted as younger than a SN landing on pixels with fainter Hα. In some sense this is backwards — the brightest H II region complexes are the longest lived ones with median ages >10 Myr, whereas more isolated, smaller, and fainter H II regions are fleeting, and have shorter ages of only $\sim$3-4 Myr. Therefore, finding a SN in a smaller isolated H II region is more likely to indicate a very high initial mass above 60 $M_{\odot}$ than if a SN is seen in a very bright and long-lived giant H II region complex (Crowther 2013). When these fainter and more isolated H II regions go preferentially undetected in ground-based imaging of distant galaxies, their associated SNe may be mistakenly assumed to come from an older population. Note that SN 1987A, with an initial mass of $\sim$18 $M_{\odot}$ would have a high correlation with star formation as seen from a distant galaxy because of its proximity to 30 Dor (only $\sim$1$''$ at a distance of 50 Mpc), whereas η Carinae would explode in the fainter Carina Nebula, which in some cases would not be detected.

Anderson et al. have discussed potential biases in detecting various SN types and found that it does not strongly impact the trends in their observations, but there may be other selection effects besides those that govern the discovery of various SN types. For example, a metallicity bias may cause there to be more of some type of SN in the inner regions of a galaxy as compared to outer regions. In a typical spiral galaxy, inner regions are more densely packed with star formation, and they have a larger fraction of the observed surface area covered by very bright H II regions than in the much sparser outer regions. Indeed, Habergham et al. (2014) found that SNe Ibc in their sample were systematically found at smaller galactic radii than SNe II. Thus, even if SN types have the same range of progenitor initial mass, a type of SN that has a preference for smaller galactocentric radii because of metallicity may have a higher probably of coincidence with a very bright H II region. The potential influence of this bias deserves further attention.

The sensitivity and potential bias in the flux-dependent Hα diagnostic used by Anderson and collaborators (Anderson & James 2009; Anderson et al. 2012; Habergham et al. 2014) may explain why their conclusions differed from other studies of SN host environments. Earlier studies of spatial proximity to H II regions (rather than the strength of Hα flux) found no statistically significant preference between SNe II and Ibc (Van Dyk 1992; Van Dyk et al. 1992; Bartunov et al. 1994). Some of these might be chance coincidence with long-lived giant H II regions at relatively course ground-based angular resolution. In general, one expects no direct correlation between a SN and its own H II region for any but the most massive stars above 75 $M_{\odot}$ (Crowther 2013). Indeed, Smartt et al. (2009) found that high resolution *HST* images for nearby SNe with good constraints on the progenitor stars do not support a correlation with H II regions, and Smartt (2009) argued against the monotonic increasing progenitor mass from Type II to IIb to Ibc based on this and a number of other considerations (see also Crowther 2013). When examining the SN host color at the location of SNe rather than host Hα, Kelly & Kirshner (2012) found that SNe Ibc, SNe II, and SNe IIn show basically the same distribution of $u' - z'$ colors. They did, however, find bluer colors for broad-lined SNe Ic and SNe IIb; it is unlikely that this is due to initial mass, since progenitor detections suggest rather low masses for SNe IIb.

One may ask, if LBVs are the mass gainers that get a kick from their companion's SN Ibc in a cluster or association, then why do we not detect bright LBVs at the positions of SNe Ibc? The most likely answer is that the mass gainer

[8] Interestingly, association with clusters does have something to do with initial masses, but not in the way that it is usually discussed. In the binary scenario, a SN located in a cluster favors the star that is the initially *more massive of the two stars* and explodes first, rather than selecting stars preferentially above some particular mass value.

will appear as a more luminous but hot O-type star that is still quite difficult to detect (see Figure 6), and may not become a visually bright LBV until 1-2 Myr later, when its own core evolution drives it off the main sequence to become a cooler B[e]/LBV supergiant. Moreover, in the binary scenario, the majority of SNe Ibc will be from relatively low initial masses, compared to the high-mass WR progenitors envisioned in the single-star scenario.

Overall, we find it likely that the sequential order of explosion in a binary system and subsequent kicks out of clusters (and to a somewhat lesser extent, metallicity and star cluster density), plus the extended main sequence lifetime before mass accretion, will have a more important influence on the observed environments of core-collapse SNe than monotonic differences in the range of initial mass. This may be especially true for more extreme or rare explosions that may require special evolutionary paths in binaries, such as long GRBs (Kelly et al. 2014; Fruchter et al. 2006).

Of course, the observed isolation of SNe IIn might also be influenced to some degree by SN IIn progenitor contamination from non-LBV objects. Indeed, there is strong evidence for this already, although the fraction of contamination is poorly constrained. In principle, any type of explosion can yield a Type IIn event, since the IIn designation depends on CSM interaction and not the explosion mechanism. While LBV mass loss fits the bill (Smith 2014), the case for LBVs is strongest for the most luminous SNe IIn where the CSM mass budget requires extreme parameters (Smith 2014). B[e] supergiants are also suitable for providing moderate-luminosity SNe IIn, and their spatial distribution is even more isolated than LBVs, comparable to RSGs (Figures 4 and 5). Moreover, the concentration of eruptive mass loss associated with the final nuclear burning sequences in the last few years before core collapse (Smith & Arnett 2014; Quataert & Shiode 2012) means that the progenitor need not have been in a dense-wind phase for very long. Besides massive LBVs exploding as SNe IIn, there are also examples where SNe IIn may result from: (1) extreme RSGs with strong clumpy winds (Smith et al. 2009a,b), (2) electron-capture SNe (ecSNe) from 8-10 $M_{\odot}$ super-AGB stars (such as the class of SNe IIn-P and possibly the Crab Nebula; Mauerhan et al. 2013; Smith 2013; Chugai et al. 2004a), and (3) some hybrid Type Ia/IIn events that are apparently thermonuclear SNe Ia exploding in a dense H-rich CSM, like SN 2002ic and several similar objects (Chugai et al. 2004b; Silverman et al. 2013). When these other objects having much lower mass progenitors are included with SNe IIn, it would make the mixed population appear statistically even more isolated. This is the likely explanation for why Habergham et al. (2014) found that SNe IIn had a spatial distribution similar to SNe II-P, even though we find LBVs have isolation intermediate between WR stars and RSGs.

It is worth reiterating the point that not all mass gainers will become LBVs, since this likely depends on the mass accreted and final luminosity (many may become B[e] supergiants instead, or they may evolve to become RSGs, etc.), and not all mass gainers will necessarily become SNe IIn, since these SNe require special conditions (pre-SN mass ejections). Comparing the observed fraction of SNe IIn (8–9% of core collapse SNe; **?**) to theoretical expectations requires continued modeling of the evolution of mass gainers, which still depends on uncertain assumptions.

In addition to core-collapse SNe, caution about inferring an initial mass also applies to SN impostors and related transients. Some eruptive transients have been discussed where the apparent age of surrounding stellar population indicates a surprisingly low initial mass. The most representative cases are SN 2008S and the 2008 transient in NGC 300 (Thompson et al. 2009; Prieto et al. 2008; Gogarten et al. 2009). If LBVs or lower-mass analogs preferentially receive a kick from an exploded companion, then this needs to be included in the uncertainty when inferring an age and initial mass from their surrounding stellar populations. One last important consequence to mention is that stars with initial masses below 8 $M_{\odot}$ may, if in a binary system, accrete mass and explode as a ccSN or an electron-capture SN, even if their initial mass would have precluded that fate in a single-star scenario. Due to the slope of the IMF, these initially lower-mass stars may potentially contribute a substantial number of observed SNe. We encourage a detailed study of this effect, including the delay time distribution and its contribution to SN statistics.

6 EPILOGUE

This paper suggests a major reversal in our interpretation of the nature of LBVs. Instead of being the result of instability in very massive single stars that have evolved to become unstable through their own core evolution and mass loss, they must preferentially or exclusively be the products of binary evolution. They are most likely the mass gainers in binary RLOF or mergers because their ages and initial masses (inferred from single-star evolution tracks) systematically disgree with the stars around them. While counter arguments can point to one or two possible exceptions, this must apply to most of the LBVs.

Why was this seemingly obvious result missed? The answer may be partly sociological: LBVs are very few in number, and η Car garners disproportionate attention, so its location in the Carina Nebula did not arouse suspicion. Also, interest in LBVs has concentrated more on driving their eruptive mass loss, as opposed to the evolutionary history that led them to be unstable in the first place. Last, LBVs seem to fit nicely into the picture of single-star evolution (and indeed they are needed for it), so the question of whether or not their environments contradict models was not pursued with adequate vigor.

Actually, a suggestive result along similar lines was found more than a decade ago by N.L. King and collaborators (2000; see also King et al. 1997, 1998, as well as Kenyon & Gallagher 1985). Based on environments of some candidate LBVs in M31, it was found that they seem to reside outside OB associations and clusters, implying stellar ages of several Myr. That work did not instigate a major rethinking of our standard paradigm of massive star evolution because the paper was not accepted for publication in the refereed literature (the first author has since left the field). In hindsight, the main result of that work appears to have pointed in the correct direction after all.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NS thanks J.S. Gallagher for discussions regarding binary

evolution and LBVs, and in particular for drawing our attention to previous work by N. King. We benefitted from discussion about SN host environments with P. Crowther, J. Anderson, and P. Kelly, and from further discussions concerning binary evolution with S. de Mink. We also thank the referee (J. Eldridge) for a careful reading and thoughtful comments that improved the paper. Partial support was provided by NSF award AST-1312221. This research has made use of the SIMBAD database, operated at CDS, Strasbourg, France.

REFERENCES

Anderson JP, James PA. 2009, MNRAS, 399, 559
Anderson JP, et al. 2012, MNRAS, 424, 1372
Bartunov O.S., Tsvetkov D.Y., Filimonova I.V., 1994, PASP, 106, 1276
Belczynski K, Bulik T. 1999, A&A, 346, 91
Bonanos, A., et al. 2009, AJ, 138, 1003
Brott I, de Mink SE, Cantiello M, et al. 2011, A&A, 530, A115
Cantiello M, Yoon SC, Langer N, Livio M. 2007, A&A, 465, L29
Chini R, Hoffmeister VH, Nasseri A, Stahl O, Zinnecker H. 2012, MNRAS, 424, 1925
Chugai NN, Blinnikov SI, Cumming RJ, et al. 2004a, MNRAS, 352: 1213
Chugai NN, Chevalier RA, Lundqvist P. 2004b, MNRAS, 355, 627
Clark JS, Larionov VM, Arkharov A. 2005, A&A, 435, 239
Clark JS, Crowther PA, Larimov VM, Steele IA, Ritchie BW, Arkharov AA. 2009, A&A, 507, 1555
Crowther PA. 2007, ARA&A, 45, 177
Crowther PA. 2013, MNRAS, 428, 1927 177
Conti PS. 1976. Mem. Soc. R. Sci. Lie'ge, 9: 193
Conti PS. 1984. IAUS, 105: 233
De Becker M, Rauw G, Manfroid J, Eenens P. 2006, A&A, 456, 1121
de Koter A, Lamers HJGLM, Schmutz W. 1996. A&A, 306: 501
de Mink SE, Pols OR, Hilditch RW. 2007, A&A, 467, 1181
de Mink SE, et al. 2013, ApJ, 764, 166
de Mink SE, et al. 2014, ApJ, 782, 7
Dessart, L., et al. 2009, MNRAS, 394, 21
Dessart L, Hillier DJ, Li C, Woosley S. 2012, MNRAS, 424, 2139
Eldridge JJ, Stanway ER. 2009, MNRAS, 400, 1019
Eldridge JJ, Izzard RG, Tout CA. 2008, MNRAS, 384, 1109
Eldridge JJ, Langer N, Tout CA. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 3501
Evans, CJ, Lennon DJ, Smartt SJ, Trundle C. 2006, A&A, 456, 623
Fox OD, et al. 2014, ApJ, 790, 17
Fruchter A.S. et al., 2006, Nat, 441, 463
Gallagher, J.S. 1989, in Physics of Luminous Blue Variables, ed. K. Davidson, A.F.J. Moffat, & H.J.G.L.M. Lamers (Dordrect: Kluwer), 185
Gies DR. 1987, ApJS, 64, 545
Gal-Yam A, Leonard CD. 2009, Nature, 458, 865
Garcia B, Mermilliod J. 2001, A&A, 368, 122
Georgy C, Ekstrom S, Meynet G, et al. 2012, A&A, 542, A29
Gogarten, S., et al. 2009, ApJ, 703, 300
Gräfener G, Vink JS, de Koter A, Langer N. 2011. A&A, 535: A56
Gräfener G, Owocki SP, Vink JS. 2012. A&A, 538: A40
Groh JH, Vink, J. 2011, A&A, 531, L10
Groh JH, Hillier DJ, Damineli A. 2006, ApJ, 638, L33
Groh JH, Hillier DJ, Damineli A, et al. 2009a, ApJ, 698, 1698
Groh JH, Hillier DJ, Damineli A, et al. 2009b, ApJ, 705, L25
Groh JH, Meynet, G, Ekström, S. 2013, A&A, 550, L7
Groh JH, Meynet, G, Ekström, S, Georgy C. 2014, A&A, 564, A30
Gvaramadze VV, Kniazev AY, Fabrika S. 2010. MNRAS, 405: 520
Habergham SM, Anderson JP, James PA, Lyman JD. 2014, MNRAS, 441, 2230
Hachinger S, Mazzali PA, Tautenberger S, et al. 2012. MNRAS, 422: 70
Heger A, Fryer CL, Woosley SE, Langer N, Hartmann DH. 2003, ApJ, 591, 288
Heydari-Malayeri M, Meynadier F, & Walborn NR. 2003, A&A, 400, 923
Hoffman JL, Leonard DC, Chornock R, Filippenko AV, Barth AJ, & Matheson T. 2008, 688, 1186
Hubble E, Sandage A. 1953, ApJ, 118, 353
Humphreys RM, Davidson K. 1994, PASP, 106, 1025
Humphreys RM, Lamers HJGLM, Hoekzema N, Cassatella A. 1989, A&A, 218, L17
Humphreys RM, Davidson K, Smith N. 1999, PASP, 111, 1124
Izzard RG, et al. 2004, MNRAS, 348, 1215
Kelly, P.L., & Kirshner, R.P. 2012, ApJ, 759, 107
Kelly, P.L., Filippenko, A.V., Modjaz, M., Kocevski, D. 2012, ApJ, 759, 107
Kenyon, S.J., & Gallagher, J.S. 1989, ApJ, 290, 542
Kiminki DC, Kobulnicky HA. 2012, ApJ, 751, 4
Kiminki DC, Kobulnicky HA, Erwig I, et al. 2012, ApJ, 747, 41
King NL, Walterbos RAM, Gallagher JS. 1997, AAS Bull., 191, 8221
King NL, Walterbos RAM, Gallagher JS, Bransford MA. 1998, AAS Bull, 193, 9909
King NL. 2000, Ph. D.Thesis, NMSU
Kobulnicky HA, Fryer CL. 2007, ApJ, 670, 747
Kobulnicky HA, Kiminki DC, Lundquist MJ, et al. 2014, preprint (arXiv:1406.6655)
Kochanek CS, Szczygiel DM, Stanek KZ. 2011. ApJ, 737, 76
Koenigsberger G, Moreno E. 2008, RevMexAA, 33, 108
Kotak R, Vink JS. 2006, A&A, 460, L5
Lamers HJGLM, & Nugis T. 2002, A&A, 395, L1
Lamers HJGLM, et al. 2001, ApJ, 551, 764
Langer N. 1998, A&A, 329, 551
Langer N. 2012, ARA&A, 50, 107
Langer N, Kudritzki RP. 2014, A&A, 564, A52
Langer N., et al. 1994, A&A, 290, 819
Larsen SS, et al. 2011, A&A, 532, A147
Leonard DC, Filippenko AV, Barth AJ, Matheson T. 2000, ApJ, 536, 239
Maeder A. 1992. in Instabilities in Evolved Super and Hypergiants, eds. C de Jager, H Nieuwenhuijzen (Amsterdam: North holland), 138
Maíz Apellániz J, et al. 2013, in Massive Stars: From α to Ω; Online at http://a2omega-conference.net.
Mahy L, et al. 2009, A&A, 502, 937
Massey P., et al. 2000, AJ, 119, 2214
Massey P., et al. 2007, AJ, 134, 2474
Mauerhan JC, Smith N, Silverman JM, et al. 2013, MNRAS, 431, 2599
Mauerhan JC, Williams GG, Smith N, et al. 2013, MNRAS, 442, 1166
Maund JR, et al. 2004, Nature, 427, 129
Meynet G, Maeder A. 2003, A&A, 404, 975
Miroshnichenko AS, et al. 2014, Adv. in Astron., 2014, 130, 378
Oey, M.S., et al. 2013, ApJ, 738, 66
Owocki S.P., et al. 2004, ApJ, 616, 525
Paczynski B. 1967, Acta Astron., 17, 355
Pasquali A, Comeron F, Nota A. 2006, A&A, 448, 589
Podsiadlowski P, Joss PC, Hsu JJL. 1992, ApJ, 391, 246
Podsiadlowski P. 2010, New Astr. Rev., 54, 39
Prieto JL, et al. 2008, ApJ, 673, 999
Prieto JL, et al. 2014, ApJ, 787, L8
Quataert E, Shiode J. 2012, MNRAS, 423, L92
Rest A, Prieto JL, Walborn NR, et al. 2012, Nature, 482, 375
Sana H, Gosset S, Naze Y, Rauw G, Linder N. 2008, MNRAS, 386, 447
Sana H, Gosset S, Evans CJ. 2009, MNRAS, 400, 1479
Sana H, et al. 2012, Science, 337, 444
Schneider FRN, et al. 2014, ApJ, 780, 117
Silverman JM, Nugent PE, Gal-Yam A, et al. 2013, ApJS, 207, 3
Smartt SJ. 2009, ARA&A, 47, 63
Smartt S.J., Eldridge J.J., Crockett R.M., Maund J.R., 2009, MNRAS, 395, 1409
Smith N. 2002, MNRAS, 337, 1252
Smith N. 2006, MNRAS, 367, 763
Smith N. 2007, AJ, 133, 1034
Smith N. 2008, Nature, 455, 201
Smith N. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 102
Smith N. 2014, ARA&A, 52, in press
Smith N., Arnett WD. 2014, ApJ, 785, 82
Smith N, & Owocki SP. 2006, ApJ, 645, L45
Smith N, & Conti PS. 2008, ApJ, 679, 1467
Smith N, Gehrz RD, Hinz PM, et al. 2003a, AJ, 125, 1458
Smith N, et al. 2003b, ApJ, 586, 432
Smith N, Vink JS, de Koter A. 2004, ApJ, 615, 475
Smith N, Hinkle KH, Ryde N. 2009a, AJ, 137
Smith N. et al., 2009b, ApJ, 695, 1334
Smith N, et al. 2010, AJ, 139, 1451
Smith N, Li W, Silverman JM, Ganeshalingam M, Filippenko AV. 2011a, MNRAS, 415, 773
Smith N, Li W, Filippenko AV, Chornock R. 2011b, MNRAS, 412, 1522
Smith N, Li W, Miller AA, Silverman JM, Filippenko AV, Cuillandre JC, Cooper MC, Matheson T, Van Dyk SD. 2011c, ApJ, 732, 63
Soker N. 2004, ApJ, 612, 1060
Stahl O., 1987, A&A, 182, 229
Stahl O, et al. 2001, A&A, 375, 54
Tammann GA, & Sandage A 1968, APJ, 151, 825
Thompson TA, Prieto JL, Stanek KZ, et al. 2009, ApJ, 705, 1364
Thorne K. S., Zytkow A. N., 1975, ApJ, 199, 19L
Thorne K. S., Zytkow A. N., 1977, ApJ, 212, 832
Trundle C, et al. 2008, A&A, 483, L47
Ulmer, A., & Fitzpatrick, E.L. 1998, ApJ, 504, 200
Vanbeveren D, De Loore C, van Rensbergen W. 1998, Astron. Astroph. Rev., 9, 63
Vanbeveren D, Van Bever J, Belkaus H. 2007, ApJ, 662, L107
Van Dyk S.D., 1992, AJ, 103, 1788
Van Dyk S.D., Hamuy M., Filippenko A.V., 1996, AJ, 111, 2017
van Genderen AM. 2001, A&A, 366, 508
van Rensbergen W, Vanbeveren D, De Loore C. 1996, A&A, 305, 825
Wachter S, Mauerhan JC, Van Dyk, SD, et al. 2010. AJ, 139: 2330
Walborn, N.R., Fitzpatrick, E.L., & Phillips, M.M. 1991, in Wolf-Rayet

Stars and Interrelations with other Massive Stars in Galaxies, ed. K.A. van der Hucht & B. Hidayat, 505
Weis, K. 2003, A&A, 408, 205
Woosley, S.E., Heger, A, Weaver, T.A. 2002, Rev. Mod. Phys., 74, 1015
Zickgraf, F.J. 2006, in Stars With the B[e] Phenomenon, ASP Conf Ser 355, ed. M. Kraus & A.S. Miroshnichenko (San Francisco: ASP), 135